

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **I. Telephone Interview**

Initially, the Applicants would like to thank Examiner Hernandez for granting and conducting a telephone interview on February 28, 2011.

During the interview the Applicants' representative discussed the possibility of amending the independent claims to clarify that said second memory is occupied only by said processing unit." The Applicants' representative emphasized the fact that this amendment is supported by Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0019], [0052], [0065], [0067], [0070] and [0076] of the publication of the present application.

The Examiner indicated that, if the Applicants filed an amendment including the above-mentioned amendment, then he would have to discuss the issue with his supervisor and more carefully study the specification of the present application.

Next, during the interview, the Applicants' representative presented the Examiner with the possibility of amending the independent claims to recite that "said second memory is occupied only by said second processing unit, when ~~such that~~ said second processing unit stores image data related to at least one of the output image data and the video signal in said second memory." The Examiner agreed that this additional amendment appears to be consistent with the specification.

Furthermore, the Examiner agreed that the Waki does not appear to disclose or suggest that "said second memory is occupied only by said processing unit, when said second processing

unit stores image data related to at least one of the output image data and the video signal in said second memory.”

## **II. Amendments to the Claims**

Based on the results of the interview, independent claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to recite that “said second memory is occupied only by said second processing unit, when-such ~~that~~ said second processing unit stores image data related to at least one of the output image data and the video signal in said second memory.” Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, support for these amendments can be found, at least, in Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0019], [0052], [0065], [0067], [0070] and [0076] of the publication of the present application (i.e., U.S. 2004/0187165).

## **III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 7, 8 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Waki (EP 1056290). Further, claims 2-6, 9-14 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki in view of various combinations of Ohba (U.S. 6,714,660), Kawakami (U.S. 2002/0012522) and the Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). These rejections are believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1, 8 and 12 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an integrated circuit including a bus, a first memory connected to the bus, a first processing unit that accesses the first memory via the bus, a second processing unit, and a second memory that is accessed by the second processing unit without passing through the bus, such that the second processing unit accesses the second

memory without accessing the bus. Further, claim 1 recites that the second memory is occupied only by the second processing unit, when the second processing unit stores image data (related to at least one of output image data and video signals) in the second memory.

As discussed during the interview, the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection (i) equates the de-multiplexer 303 and the decoder 306 of Waki with the claimed second processing unit, (ii) equates the high-speed memory 307 of Waki with the claimed second memory, and (iii) equates the memory unit 310 and the storage unit 312 with the claimed first memory, as recited in previously presented claim 1. However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure of the second memory and the second processing unit, it is submitted that Waki fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by the second memory and the second processing unit, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Waki teaches that the high speed memory 307 (equated with the claimed second memory) is accessible by both the decoder 306 (equated with the claimed second processing unit) and, at least, the de-multiplexer 303 connected to the bus 314, as well as other components connected to the bus 314 (see Fig. 2 and paragraph [0091]).

Thus, in view of the above and as agreed upon during the interview, because Waki teaches that, at least, the de-multiplexer 303, the decoder 306, and other components connected to the bus 314 all store image data on the high speed memory 307, Waki cannot be said to disclose or suggest that the second memory is occupied only by the second processing unit, when that the second processing unit stores image data in the second memory, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that independent claim 1 and claims 7 and 15 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Waki.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waki in view of various combinations of Ohba, Kawakami and the AAPA (additional references), it is respectfully submitted that these additional references do not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claim 1 which are lacking from the Waki reference. Therefore, no obvious combination of Waki with any of the additional references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Waki, Ohba, Kawakami and/or the AAPA or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Waki, Kawakami and/or the AAPA to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-7 and 15 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 8 and 12 are directed to an electric device and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 8 and 12 and claims 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji KAI et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2011.03.14 15:37:47 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap  
Registration No. 60,554  
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led  
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
March 14, 2011